# CONTAIN THE VIRUS

## Uniqueness

#### Trump wants to cut humanitarian aid funding but GOP is holding him back

**Torbati** **17’** Torbati, Yeganeh. “Republicans Push Back against Trump Plan to Cut Foreign Aid.” Reuters, Thomson Reuters, 23 May 2017, www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-budget-foreign-aid/republicans-push-back-against-trump-plan-to-cut-foreign-aid-idUSKBN18J2DC.

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - U.S. President Donald **Trump**’s fellow Republicans in Congress on Tuesday **assailed his proposed cuts in the diplomatic and foreign aid budget**, making it unlikely the **cutbacks in global health, peacekeeping and other programs** will take effect. Senator Lindsey Graham, the **Republican chairman** of the Senate subcommittee responsible for diplomacy and foreign aid spending, **said Trump’s proposal** to cut the diplomacy and aid budget by one third **would “gut soft power.”** “If we implemented this budget, you’d have to retreat from the world or put a lot of people at risk,” Graham told reporters. “This budget is not going to go anywhere.” Congress sets the federal government budget, and **Republicans** who control both houses and Democrats have **said they do not support** such drastic **cuts.** The funding cuts in Trump’s plan for the fiscal year beginning in October would mark a stark decrease in non-military U.S. government engagement abroad as the administration pursues Trump’s “America First” world view. Trump administration officials defend the cuts by saying the rest of the world must do its “fair share” as the United States retreats from its traditional spending abroad. In all, the **Trump proposal** **cuts** about 32 percent from U.S. diplomacy and aid budgets, or **nearly $19 billion.** Trump’s budget would cut U.S. funding for global health programs including efforts focusing on HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria by about one quarter, to about $6.5 billion for 2018. The budget proposal envisions cuts to the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) program, a cornerstone of U.S. global health assistance, which supports HIV/AIDS treatment, testing and counseling for millions of people worldwide. Under Trump’s budget, PEPFAR funding would be $5 billion per year compared to about $6 billion annually now, the State Department said. No patient currently receiving antiretroviral therapy, a treatment for HIV, through PEPFAR funds will lose that treatment, officials said.

## Link

#### Increase in spending will cause a trade off in new programs

Khimm 11’ Suzy, Kimm Mother Jones, 2011 Suzy, Washington Bureau of Mother Jones, “How Not to Cut the Deficit” January 6, 2011, <http://motherjones.com/politics/2011/01/cutgo-deficit-boehner>)

**Under** the Democrats' "**p**ay-**a**s-**y**ou-**go**" rules—introduced during the Clinton era and continued under President Obama—**Congress had to match every spending increase or tax cut with a commensurate spending cut or tax increase. The GOP has** now **upended "pay-go" with "cut-go" rules, under which tax cuts don't have to be paid for and tax increases can't offset spending hikes**. "The idea is that the only two things you can do are cut spending and cut taxes," explains the Washington Post's Ezra Klein. The problem is that cutting taxes without paying for them gives the government less to work with when it comes to balancing the budget and reducing the deficit. Effectively, the **GOP rules** could **make it** even **more difficult to create new government programs**, while making it far easier for the GOP to hand tax breaks to corporations and the wealth

#### The plan spends billions – added personnel would be expensive—it'd force compromise on the budget to free up space for equipping and training service members.

**Becker et al** **07’** Becker, Gary, and Richard Posner. “Universal National Service--Posner.” The Becker-Posner Blog, Gary Becker and Richard Posner, 23 Sept. 2007, www.becker-posner-blog.com/2007/09/universal-national-service--posner.html.

There are perennial calls for drafting all 18 year olds to serve in either the military or some civilian alternative. Congressman Charles Rangel has repeatedly introduced bills in Congress (the "Universal National Service Act") that would do this. The bills have never come close to passage, and are unlikely to in the future even with Democratic control of both houses of Congress. But universal national service is one of those seductive ideas that refuse to die completely, and perhaps therefore it deserves a serious analysis. It is analytically interesting and can serve as an example of the utility of a cost-benefit approach to public programs. Roughly 4 million Americans reach the age of 18 every year. There are only 1.4 million active-duty military personnel, so only a small fraction of each vintage of 18 year olds could be assigned to the military. At their present size, our active-duty armed forces require only about 150,000 new recruits each year. So any **universal national service** obligation **would** have to be **primarily an obligation to do civilian work.** Civilian national service (in the United States--thus excluding the Peace Corps, and the missionary work that young Mormon men are required to perform for two years without compensation) funded by the federal government exists already. The "AmeriCorps" program provides federal grants to a large number of service organizations, both public and private. Although these **organizations pay** only the living expenses of their volunteers plus a modest education grant, the federal **contribution amounts to some $27,000 per volunteer.** The **number of volunteers supported by AmeriCorps** grants **is** small--well **under 100,000.** But of course total volunteer activity is much greater than that, and by no means limited to young persons--an affiliate of AmeriCorps is the "Senior Corps." A survey by the U.S. Department of Labor found that there were some 60 million American engaged in volunteer activities in 2006 and that the median number of hours that the volunteers devoted to such activities was about 50 hours a year. Thus, assuming that the average is not much different from the median and that a full-time job is 2000 hours a year, there were the equivalent of 1.5 million full-time volunteers (50/2000 x 60 million). That number is important because a universal national service obligation would have a substitution effect: someone required by law to provide a year of national service would be likely to reduce the amount of volunteer service that he would provide in the future. If, for example, there were a two-thirds reduction in volunteering, from 1.5 million full-tine equivalents to 500,000, and thus a loss of 1 million full-time-equivalent volunteers, universal national service would augment volunteer activities by only 3 million full-time equivalents a year (4 million - 3 million). Granted, **this number would rise if universal national service** had a complementary effect on volunteer service rather than or, more plausibly, as well as a substitution effect--if, that **is**, the year of obligatory service **created** a taste for such service. I find this implausible. If 4 million persons were conscripted for one year's national service, at an annual expense of $27,000 per person, **the program would cost more than $100 billion a year**--probably much more, because the $27,000 figure excludes the overhead expenses of the service organizations that receive the per capita grants. The $100 billion (or whatever the correct figure is) would be a transfer payment, but it would generate costs of two types. The first would be the deadweight costs that the taxes required to fund the payment would impose. The second and doubtless greater cost would be the difference between the value of the conscripts' national service work and the value of their output in whatever jobs they would have had were it not for their national service obligations. About half the 18 year olds would (but for their national service obligation) be in college rather than working, **and** so **the effect of universal national service** on them **would** be to **postpone their entry into the job market** by a year. Their lost wages in their first job would be a rough estimate of the value of their work in that job. The starting salary for college graduates is more than $40,000, other than for liberal-arts majors, and this is about twice the starting salary for high school graduates. That is some evidence that a universal **national service program would be inefficient**: it would in effect reallocate a year of a college graduate's working life from after college to before college, when he would be less productive. Against this it could be argued that the national service work that the 18 year olds would perform would have a social value in excess of its private value. But this seems unlikely for most jobs that these teenagers would perform, such as helping out in hospitals and nursing homes and picking up litter on roadsides and in parks. A possible exception is tutoring children, since education produces significant social benefits. But only a small fraction of the 4 million national service conscripts could usefully be employed in that activity. Universal national service would also have peculiar effects on the distribution of income. The unpaid national service workers would replace low-paid service workers, pushing many of them into poverty. Proponents argue that, all narrowly "economic" issues to one side, universal national service would confer intangible social benefits in the form of increased solidarity, as all Americans would share in the experience of working for the overall social good without compensation beyond modest living expenses. But given the heterogeneity of the jobs that the national service workers would be performing, the solidarity-enhancing effect would surely be quite limited. It would be different if the 4 million were all drafted into the armed forces for a year, but that is infeasible. In a candid moment proponents of universal national service might respond that its real purpose is to take rich kids down a peg by forcing them to work for a year with minimal compensation. The hope would be that the experience would make the rich empathize more with the poor and therefore treat them more generously. This seems unlikely, though the issue is worth studying. A person's attitude toward issues of distributive justice is shaped by a variety of factors, including temperament, parental values--and personal experiences not limited to a year's working without pay.

## I-Link

#### Cuts in aid leads to spread of disease

**Kates et al** **17’** Jennifer Katesm Adam Wexler, JoshVice President and Director of Global Health and HIV Policy at the Kaiser Family Foundation, where she oversees the Foundation's policy analysis and research focused on the U.S. government's role in global health and on the global and domestic HIV epidemics~, "What Could U.S. Budget Cuts Mean for Global Health?", Kaiser Foundation, 13 Jun 2017

Based on our models, the **potential health impacts of** these one-year **cuts is significant** across all three budget scenarios. For example, depending on the size of the cut, we estimate that starting next year: Additional **new HIV infections would range from 49,100 to 198,700**; the number of people on antiretrovirals could decline by more than 830,000 in the steepest budget cut scenario; Additional new **TB cases would range from 7,600 to 31,100**; The number of women and couples receiving contraceptives would decline, ranging from 6.2 million to almost 24 million; the increase in the number of abortions would range between 778,000 to almost 3 million; and **Additional maternal, newborn, and child deaths would range between 7,000 and 31,300.** While the fate of this year’s global health budget remains uncertain, **these models illustrate the relationship between** such decisions and health outcomes **in low- and middle-income countries** and provide one important tool for assessing future budget choices.

## Impact

#### Disease causes extinction

**South China Morning Post 96’** (Avi Mensa, 1-4-1994, “Leading the way to a cure for AIDS,” P.Lexis)

Despite the importance of the discovery of the "facilitating" cell, it is not what Dr Ben-Abraham wants to talk about. **There is a much more pressing medical crisis at hand** - one he believes the world must be alerted to: **the possibility of a virus deadlier than HIV**. If this makes Dr Ben-Abraham sound like a prophet of doom, then he makes no apology for it. **AIDS**, **the Ebola outbreak** which killed more than 100 people in Africa last year, **the flu epidemic** that has now affected 200,000 in the former Soviet Union - they **are** all, according to Dr Ben-Abraham, **the "tip of the iceberg"**. Two decades of intensive study and research in the field of virology have convinced him of one thing: in place of natural and man-made disasters or nuclear warfare, **humanity could face extinction** because of a single virus, deadlier than HIV. "**An airborne virus is a** lively, complex and **dangerous organism**," he said. "**It can come from** a rare animal or from **anywhere and** can **mutate constantly**. If there is no cure, it affects one person and then there is a chain reaction and it is unstoppable. **It is a tragedy waiting to happen**."That may sound like a far-fetched plot for a Hollywood film, but Dr Ben -Abraham said history has already proven his theory. Fifteen years ago, few could have predicted the impact of AIDS on the world. Ebola has had sporadic outbreaks over the past 20 years and the only way the deadly virus - which turns internal organs into liquid - could be contained was because it was killed before it had a chance to spread. Imagine, he says, if it was closer to home: an outbreak of that scale in London, New York or Hong Kong. It could happen anytime in the next 20 years - theoretically, it could happen tomorrow.The shock of the AIDS epidemic has prompted virus experts to admit "that something new is indeed happening and that **the threat of a deadly viral outbreak is imminent**", said Joshua Lederberg of the Rockefeller University in New York, at a recent conference. He added that the problem was "very serious and is getting worse". Dr Ben-Abraham said: "Nature isn't benign. The survival of the human species is not a preordained evolutionary programme. Abundant sources of genetic variation exist for viruses to learn how to mutate and evade the immune system." He cites the 1968 Hong Kong flu outbreak as an example of how viruses have outsmarted human intelligence. And as new "mega-cities" are being developed in the Third World and rainforests are destroyed, disease-carrying animals and insects are forced into areas of human habitation. "**This raises the very real possibility that lethal, mysterious viruses would, for the first time, infect humanity at a large scale and imperil the survival of the human race**," he said.

# Frontlines

## Case Blocks